



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,589	11/22/2002	Hans Zschintzsch	50029-00001	8347

7590 11/28/2007  
Kenneth J Johnson  
Marsh Fischmann & Breyfogle  
Suite 411  
3151 South Vaughn Way  
Aurora, CO 80014

EXAMINER
----------

CASCA, FRED A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/28/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/018,589	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ZSCHINTZSCH, HANS	
	<b>Examiner</b> Fred A. Casca	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on September 6, 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on September 6, 2007.

Claims 12-31 are still pending in the present application.

2. Applicant's arguments with reference to the rejection of claims 12-31 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is persuasive. Therefore the rejection of claims 13-31 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is withdrawn.

3. Claim 15-17 and 20-22 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Dependent claims 15-17 and 20-22 depend on multiple claims. A correction is required to place them in proper dependent form.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2617

5. Claims 12-14, 18-19, 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukherjee et al (US Patent Number 6,289,223) in view of Pecan et al (US 6,493,559 B1).

Regarding claim 26, Mukherjee et al. discloses a method of providing a cellular broadcast center with a cellular broadcast message (column 2, lines 1-4, 10-13 & 32-36; column 1, line 48; title), comprising:

receiving a short message (column 2, line 45; column 3, line 65; column 4, line 60) from a short message center (SMS-IW MSC 16); (see column 3, lines 5-14); converting the short message into a cellular broadcast message ("an originating mobile unit may then transmit an SMS message to a plurality of destination units by transmitting an SMS message addressed to a predefined usergroup MSISDN" - abstract: therefore, the SMS message is translated into cellular broadcast message as claimed; see also column 2, lines 10-21 & 24-26; column 4, lines 3-6; column 7, lines 4-6); forwarding the cellular broadcast message to a cellular broadcast center by means of a process that applies to the cell broadcast center such that the cellular broadcast message is broadcast to subscriber within a defined area of cell broadcast center (column 3, lines 17-20, SMS-GMSC 20).

Mukherjee does not specifically disclose wherein broadcasting does not define the subscribers as part of a user group, as claimed.

Pecan discloses a method of receiving SMS where broadcasting does not define the subscribers as part of a user group, as claimed (col. 1, lines 23-50, "permits the

broadcast of unacknowledged messages to all receivers within a specific geographical region"). An advantage of broadcasting to all receivers is in case of in emergency where a message needs to be transmitted to all receivers.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Mukherjee by incorporating the teachings of Pecen in the format claimed by applicant, for the purpose of ensuring transmitting of emergency messages to all members.

Regarding claim 27, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecen discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 26). In addition, Mukherjee et al. discloses wherein the cellular broadcast center delivers the cellular broadcast message to all subscribers (usergroup) in communication with a mobile station associated with the cellular broadcast center (comparing and selecting multipoint usergroup) (see abstract; column 3, lines 20-25; column 4, line 59 to column 5, line 5).

Regarding claim 28, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecen discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 26). In addition, Mukherjee et al. discloses wherein converting includes performing authentication of a subscriber associated with the short message (determining origination authentication - see column 3, lines 20-25; column 4, line 59 to column 5, line 5).

Regarding claim 29, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecen discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 26). In addition, Mukherjee et al. discloses wherein the forwarding is performed through a process valid for transmitting cellular

broadcast messages (column 3, lines 17-20: "forwarding", as taught by Mukherjee et al., is in fact a process. The process/forwarding is fairly characterized as "valid").

Regarding claim 30, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecen discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 26). In addition, Mukherjee et al. discloses wherein converting includes formatting the short message ("an originating mobile unit may then transmit an SMS message to a plurality of destination units by transmitting an SMS message addressed to a predefined usergroup MSISDN" - abstract: therefore, the SMS message is translated or formatted; see also column 2, lines 10-21 & 24-26; column 4, lines 3-6; column 7, lines 4-6).

Regarding claim 31, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecen discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 26). In addition, Mukherjee et al. discloses wherein the converting includes using a part of the short message to determine a routing instruction (SMS message is encapsulated with MSISDN of destination users, which is routing information/instruction - column 6, lines 30-53; particularly lines 40-45; also see column 3, line 15) (message is addressed to group: i.e. used to determine routing instruction. See abstract; column 2, lines 10-21 & 24-26; column 4, lines 3-6; column 7, lines 4-6).

Regarding claim 12, Mukherjee et al discloses a process of allowing direct access for individual subscribers to a cellular phone network (Figure 1) with existing cell broadcast services (column 2, lines 1-4, 10-13 & 32-36; column 1, line 48; title), the process comprising accepting a point-to-point short message from a cellular

Art Unit: 2617

phone (12) equipped to exchange point-to-point short messages (column 2, line 45; column 3, line 65; column 4, line 60) with a short-message center (SMS-IW MSC 16) over a cellular phone network (10 - Figure 1), (see column 3, lines 5-14);

providing a coupling instance (SC 18) interconnectable with the short-message center (SMS-IW MSC 16); (see column 3, lines 15-20);

doing at least one of: a test (determines destination / subscriber status), an adjustment (parses the messages) and a conversion (deciphers the messages) of the point-to-point short message necessary to convert the point-to-point short message into a cellular broadcast message in the coupling instance (SC 18) (see column 3, lines 20-25; column 4, line 59 to column 5, line 5); ["an originating mobile unit may then transmit an SMS message to a plurality of destination

units by transmitting an SMS message addressed to a predefined usergroup MSISDN"

- abstract:

therefore, the SMS message is translated into cellular broadcast message as claimed;

see also

column 2, lines 10-21 & 24-26; column 4, lines 3-6; column 7, lines 4-6]; and forwarding the cellular broadcast message to a cell broadcast center (SMS-GMSC 20) by means of a process (e.g. forwarding) that applies to the cell broadcast center (see column 3, lines 17-20); [Forwarding, as taught by Mukherjee et al., is in fact a process. Thus the limitation "by means of a process that applies to the cell broadcast center" is inherent, since such process is needed for the system to operate, and it has to be applicable to the cell broadcast center because it is the one receiving the forwarded messages], the

cellular broadcast message is broadcasted to subscribers within a defined area of the cell broadcast center as claimed.

However, Mukherjee et al. fails particularly disclose that the network is a digital cellular phone network in the invention embodiment, as claimed.

In the background of the invention, Mukherjee et al. teaches several different digital- based telecommunications systems, such as GSM and PCS, that provide non-speech services to mobile subscribers, such as short message services (see column 1, lines 30-40). Consequently, Mukherjee et al. suggests to apply their improved SMS service in a digital cellular phone network, such as GSM.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Mukherjee et al.'s short message method in a digital cellular phone network because digital-based standards, like GSM, are widely used; hence, an increased number of users can benefit from the service.

Mukherjee does not specifically disclose wherein broadcasting does not define the subscribers as part of a user group, as claimed.

Pecen discloses a method of receiving SMS where broadcasting does not define the subscribers as part of a user group, as claimed (col. 1, lines 23-50, "permits the broadcast of unacknowledged messages to all receivers within a specific geographical region"). An advantage of broadcasting to all receivers is in case of in emergency where a message needs to be transmitted to all receivers.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the process of Mukherjee by incorporating the teachings of Pecan in



the format claimed by applicant, for the purpose of ensuring transmitting of emergency messages to all members.

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecen discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 12). In addition, Mukherjee et al. discloses wherein a parameter (group identifier or usergroup MSISDN) for using cell broadcast is given by the subscriber (user) in the point-to-point short message (the user enters the group identifier when initiating the SMS transmission - column 2, lines 13-21 & 24-27; column 3, lines 55-56).

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecen discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 12). In addition, Mukherjee et al. discloses wherein a parameter for using cell broadcast is predetermined (beforehand / prior arrangements - column 4, lines 49-53) and are added to the broadcast message by the coupling instance (SC 18) (column 3, lines 20-25; column 4, line 67 to column 5, line 2).

Regarding claim 18, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecen discloses a device for allowing direct access for individual subscribers to a cellular phone network (Figure 1) with existing cell broadcast services (column 2, lines 1-4, 10-13 & 32-36; column 1, line 48; title), wherein the cellular phones (12) of the subscribers (users) are equipped to exchange point-to-point short messages (column 2, line 45; column 3, line 65; column 4, line 60) with a short-message center (SMS-IWMSC 16) over the cellular phone network (10 - Figure 1), (see column 3, lines 5-14), whereby short messages declared cell broadcast messages ("an originating mobile unit may then transmit an SMS message to

Art Unit: 2617

a plurality of destination units by transmitting an SMS message addressed to a predefined usergroup MSISDN" - abstract; column 2, lines 10-21 & 24-26; column 4, lines 3-6; column 7, lines 4-6) are forwarded to a cell broadcast center (SMS-GMSC 20), (see column 3, lines 15-20). The cellular broadcast message is broadcasted to subscribers within a defined area of the cell broadcast center as claimed (because it can only be received by subscribers within a range of the broadcast cell tower), the device comprising:

a coupling instance (SC 18) connected to a short message center (SMS-IWMSC 16), which accepts (column 3, lines 14-16; see also Figure 1) point-to-point short message (column 2, line 45; column 3, line 65; column 4, line 60); and means of doing (inherent) at least one of: a test (for determining destination and subscriber status), an adjustment (for parsing the messages), and a conversion (for deciphering the messages) of the point-to-point short message necessary to convert the point-to-point short message into a cellular broadcast message (see column 3, lines 20-25; column 4, line 59 to column 5, line 5) ("means of doing" inherent from the explained function) ["an originating mobile unit may then transmit an SMS message to a plurality of destination units by transmitting an SMS message addressed to a predefined usergroup MSISDN" - abstract: therefore, the SMS message is translated into cellular broadcast message as claimed; see also column 2, lines 10-21 & 24-26; col. 4, lines 3-6; column 7, lines 4-6]; wherein the coupling instance (SC 18) is connected to a cell broadcast center (SMS-GMSC 20) to which the converted message is forwarded (see column 3, lines 17-20).

However, Mukherjee et al. fails particularly disclose that the network is a digital cellular phone network, as claimed.

In the background of the invention, Mukherjee et al. teaches several different digital- based telecommunications systems, such as GSM and PCS, that provide non-speech services to mobile subscribers, such as short message services (see column 1, lines 30-40). Consequently, Mukherjee et al. suggests to apply their improved SMS service in a digital cellular phone network, such as GSM.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Mukherjee et al.'s short message method in a digital cellular phone network because digital-based standards, like GSM, are widely used; hence, an increased number of users can benefit from the service.

Mukherjee does not specifically disclose wherein broadcasting does not define the subscribers as part of a user group, as claimed.

Pecen discloses a method of receiving SMS where broadcasting does not define the subscribers as part of a user group, as claimed (col. 1, lines 23-50, "permits the broadcast of unacknowledged messages to all receivers within a specific geographical region"). An advantage of broadcasting to all receivers is in case of in emergency where a message needs to be transmitted to all receivers.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Mukherjee by incorporating the teachings of Pecan in the format claimed by applicant, for the purpose of ensuring transmitting of emergency messages to all members.

Regarding claim 19, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecen discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 18). In addition, Mukherjee et al. discloses wherein the point-to-point short messages contain parameters (group identifier or usergroup MSISDN) for defining the broadcast area (see column 2, lines 13-21 & 24-27; column 3, lines 55-56) and, if necessary, other parameters (for example, origination related data, etc. - column 3, lines 21-24).

Regarding claim 21/18 and 21/19/18, Mukherjee et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 18-19). In addition, Mukherjee et al. discloses wherein a filter component (for comparing and selecting multipoint usergroup) is provided in the coupling instance (SC 18) (see column 3, lines 20-25; column 4, line 59 to column 5, line 5)

("component" is inherent from the respective explained functions).

Regarding claim 23, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecen discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 12). In addition, Mukherjee et al. discloses filtering (comparing and selecting multipoint usergroup) the point-to-point short message based on a subscriber associated with the cellular phone (see column 3, lines 20-25; column 4, line 59 to column 5, line 5).

Regarding claims 24-25, Mukherjee et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 12 and 18). In addition, Mukherjee et al. discloses wherein the point-to-point short message is declared as an intended cellular broadcast message by a subscriber associated with the cellular phone ("an originating mobile unit

may then transmit an SMS message to a plurality of destination units by transmitting an SMS message addressed to a predefined usergroup "MSISDN" - abstract; column 2, lines 10-21 & 24-26; column 4, lines 3-6; column 7, lines 4-6).

Further, claims 24-25 include a recitation of intended use. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

6. Claims 15/12, 15/13/12, and 15/14/12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukherjee et al. (US Patent Number 6,289,223) in view of Pecan et al (US 6,493,559 B1) and further in view of Sikand et al. (US Patent Number 5,515,421).

Regarding claims 15/12, 15/13/12, and 15/14/12, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecan discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 12-14). However, Mukherjee et al. fails to specifically disclose that the area to which the cellular broadcast message applies is determined by giving the dialing prefix, the postal code or the vehicle license number, as claimed.

Sikand et al. discloses a message broadcasting method wherein callers (area to which the

broadcast message applies) are identified according to a one or more common defined characteristics, such as, area code (dialing prefix), zip code (postal code), or any other caller characteristics or codes (for example, vehicle license number) (see column 1,

Art Unit: 2617

lines 50-54 & 61- 67). For example, if the broadcast message is local weather the caller identification would be the zip code (postal code) (column 2, lines 1-3, and column 3, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine the area to which the cellular broadcast message applies by using a dialing prefix, a postal code or a vehicle license number, because the information can be, for example, geographically dependent, such as local weather, in which case the information is pertinent for a particular zip code group, as taught by Sikand.

7. Claims 16/12, 16/13/12, 16/14/12, 17/12, 17/13/12, 17/14/12, 20/18, 20/19/18, 21/18/, 21/19, and 22/19/18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukherjee et al.

(US Patent Number 6,289,223) in view of Pecan et al (US 6,493,559 B1) and further in view of Vedel (US Patent Number 5,974,308).

Regarding claims 20/18, 20/19/18, 22/18 and 22/19/18, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecan discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 18-19). However, Mukherjee et al. fails to specifically disclose an accounting instance / billing entity provided in the coupling instance, as claimed.

Vedel discloses message broadcasting apparatus wherein accounting instance / billing entity provided for the purpose of informing users a rate of charge (see abstract; column 3, lines 15-35 of Vedel). Since the coupling instance (SC 18 of Mukherjee et

al.) performs most of the short-message service processing (column 3, lines 20-24; column 4, lines 53 and 67 to column 5, line 10, inter alia, of Mukherjee et al), it would have been obvious to also perform the needed accounting / billing process since its location is not critical, as it can be seen from Vedel. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Mukherjee et al.'s device with an accounting instance / billing entity provided in the coupling instance, because, first, it is needed for the purpose of selling the broadcast services, and, second, it can be used to inform users a rate of charge, as taught by Vedel.

Regarding claims 21/18, 21/19, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecen discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 12-14). However, Mukherjee et al. fails to specifically disclose a filter component as claimed. However, provision of these filtering is obvious expedient in view of Vedel as explained for claims 20 and 22 above, explanation that is applied and incorporated herein by reference.

Regarding claims 16/12, 16/13/12, 16/14/12, 17/12, 17/13/12, and 17/14/12, the combination of Mukherjee/Pecen discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 12-14). However, Mukherjee et al. fails to specifically disclose an accounting methods as claimed. However, provision of these accounting methods is obvious expedient in view of Vedel as explained for claims 20 and 22 above, explanation that is applied and incorporated herein by reference.

### **Response to Arguments**

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### **Conclusion**

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred A. Casca whose telephone number is (571) 272-7918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid, can be reached at (571) 272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
**LESTER G. KINCAID**  
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER